I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with Section 1.6(a)(4).

Date: September 15, 2008

Electronic Signature for Michael A. Oblon: /Michael A. Oblon/

Attorney Docket No.: 60644-8016.US01

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Pate	ent Application of:		
	Daniel Isaac Goodman) Daniel Schreiber)	Examiner: Art Unit:	Nadia Khoshnoodi 2137
Application No: 09/774,236		Confirmation No.: 9845	
Filed:	January 29, 2001)		
For:	METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR) COPY PROTECTION OF DATA) CONTENT)		

MISCELLANEOUS RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT AMENDMENT

Sir:

An Action mailed August 14, 2008 in the above-captioned application concludes that Applicants' response filed March 17, 2008 ("Response") is non-responsive to the Office Action dated October 17, 2007 ("the Office Action") for failing to address every rejected independent claim in the corresponding Remarks section. Specifically, the Action concludes that Applicants improperly grouped independent claims 1, 26, 51, 72, 115, 124, 141-142 and 171-174 together in arguing limitations concerning a recited "patched operating system function," yet claims 51, 72, 115, 124, 172 and 173 allegedly did not include this limitation. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

As reproduced in Appendix A in bold text, each of claims 51, 72, 115, 124, 172 and 173 as amended in the March 17, 2008 Response does in fact recite a limitation regarding a "patched operation system function". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Response filed March 17, 2008 is fully responsive to the Office Action and is compliant in accordance with 37 CFR 1.121. As stated in that Response, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of all outstanding rejections